Mr. Paul Wuhtzel
1688 Sunset Plaza Drive
Los Angeles, CA. 90069

5/29/76

Dear Paul,

Weboth thanks you for your 5/26, the effort it represents and for the enclosures I'll read when resting. I want to address the experiences you've had before I can be interrupted. We expect friends sometime today, anytime now.

By and large I agree with Gary Horowitz. His reaction is another example of how counterproductive it can be to impose paranoia on oneself. However, as you indicate, he has a naive concept because as I told you Executive Action is for all practical purposes a spook job. Maltz and the others are the captives of the cliches they have successfully exploited. They do not see how interference today would guarantee the success of a flick, if it today were to be attempted. I think it unlikely. Besides, a suit would make the picture and achaieve other good results. Their understandable fears are based on a serious misapprehension: this proposal ~~xxxx~~ is for a movie on the King assassination, not on James Earl Ray. He is a necessary but minor character in The King Conspiracies. There is no possible in-court development that can change any good script. Not in any substantive way.

I think Maltz has the same basic misunderstanding.

For Wakeford-Orloff this kind of film would represent one step forward. Instead of hoking it up and pretending it was all official evidence they'd really have the official evidence. Sure it will hurt the FBI. But they'll have little choice. They'll blame it all on the departed Founding Father, the saint. They'll not dare interfere with the picture or its distribution. If they make the attempt during production it can be written into the script. If they do it afterward it will come to official attention in the Congress. I think there today is no doubt at all. This fear would inhibit them if they had the temptation. If it alone did not my being in court and my record with them in coyrt is enough to assure they'll not be that silly.

The real fear I'd imagine is not at all possible in this kind of movie: the mob. An honest Bob not only does not hurt them- they'd like it.

The problem I see with W-O is that they produce and they's want Lewis, not you, to produce it.

I know of Lewis. A friend was to have arranged a meeting with him during the Executive Qction days. It did not come off. Maybe he was afraid of what I'd do to Lane. Did once on Washington TV, matter of fact.

All of this gets to the problem of never being face-to-face with these kinds of people. There is too much they imagine, too much they do not understand and can't see. I believe they are so adjusted to dealing with the unreal they forget their own fantastic successes when they dealt wit the real. I believe also that they visualize non-existing complications. There are some with this movie but you've reported none that I see and do not expect to become significant. I hope it is not too much of a simplification to suggest that these people just arenot used to the solid, factual work I do with the manifestations ranging from Percy Foreman fleeing a TV studio rather than confronting me <u>after</u> all I'd said about him to the FBI and Justice Department praising me when I charge them with felonies. I don't believe that people who have been successful in Hollywood can begin to see, on their own, how Establishmentarian my work really is, either.

There is a new Vegas interest. It may yet lead to my getting withim striking distance of LA. I would like to be able to speak directly to these people and address their questions and doubts.

You should know there are other projects afoot for whatever this can mean. Both of which I know are bad. Freed is still trying to steal and has made some kind of offbeat deal with Jack Youngblood, Dick Russell and Ernie Baxter, a real nut who is no longer editor of Argosy. Freed has written Ray, who has not told Him or me. And Huie appears to have made a deal for his book. This is why, I think without explaining it, I asked you about "Talking Tall." I understand that is the [redacted] company.

I'm sorry you do not report - and I suppose because you did not learn - why W-O opted getting Lifton to "research" instead of accepting my open offer of my work. In normal considerations it makes no sense at all. I'm still interested if you can find out. If it is what I do not pretend to know, typically Hollywood, it appears to me to be very bad business in the commercial sense of business. Without this foolish approach they could have had a safe movie close to ready when it could have meant real money for them. Nothing has happened that could have jeopardized it. It could, in fact, have had enormous prospect right now. I wonder if Horowitz can now see this.

I have no records of when the 10 approached me through Dmytryk but I recall it well as I do what I gave them. It was while they were before the committee. It was long before any charges were made in court. Probably a day or so, not much more, after the first hearing. It was before any of them had to go to Washington and leave with any recess, if there was one. I'm talking about the earliest days of this fiasco. And what I gave them was enough to convict members of the commitee and its staff of fraud, of gypping the government out of small sums. Even enough to prove that what was represented as real hearing never took place, was merely typed up as though there had been one. I remember the case of a never-held hearing on Consumers' Union. I may still have carbons of some of this if Waltz had a continuing interest. Some of the proofs are quite simple. Like Dies' expense account for a trip home to Orange Texas at the time the "hearing" shows he was in Washington holding the hearing. For all their sophistication these hurt people were Hollywood types who did not know how to fight, even those with the heart to fight. I gave them more than enough.

They could have turned all of history around with effective use of it. My guess is that the fink killed it all and that men like Waltz, Trumbo and others never had any glimmer of what I believe they would have understood. I wondered at the time why I never heard anything further from any of them and why my records were never returned. Why in fact I never had even a pro forma thanks from any of the other nine or their friends. If Waltz wants to know more tell him to phone me. If, if I ever get out there and he wants to talk, I've be glad to take the time.

Thanks for the registration, too. I have to get to other things now.

By the way, the legal significance of a Huie movie now is that it can be enough to go back to 6th circuit with a request for a rehearing. Foreman gets a 60% cut of Huie on it. The contracting of this movie proves our argument in irreconcilable conflict of interest. Jim thinks this, as I do, too.

Thanks and best,